



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The composition is externally of twigs, rootlets, moss and coarse grass, while the lining generally consists of fine rootlets. Occasionally, however, a nest is found thickly lined with horse and cow-hair.

The number of eggs in a complete set varies from three to five, the latter number being very rare, while three is nearly as often found as four. In color the eggs have a bluish-green ground, rather sparsely spotted and dotted with colors varying from lavender to greenish brown and almost black. A few specimens rather closely resemble some eggs of *erythromelas*, but the vast majority have a much deeper blue ground color and the markings have a less reddish tinge. The markings generally tend to the formation of a ring around the larger end, but the eggs are always more or less marked over their entire surface.

The variation in size is considerable, the largest in our collecting measuring .96x.67 inches, while the smallest is .86x.67 inches. The average of twelve eggs taken at random shows a measurement of .925x.654 inches. Of course none of the eggs mentioned are in any way abnormal. These birds are seldom very solicitous about their nest and eggs. The female sits closely until forced to leave the nest, then flies to a short distance and soon brings the male by her chipping and soft purring notes. Both then come back and watch the intruder at a short distance, with but little display of anxiety.

* * *

Eastern Limit of Lawrence Goldfinch.

In his 'Birds of North and Middle America,' Dr. Ridgway gives the eastern limit of the range of Lawrence goldfinch (*Astragalinus lawrencei*) as Fort Whipple and Pinal County, Arizona. I have two specimens (♂ and ♀) that I shot January 20, 1876 near Fort Bayard, Grant County, New Mexico, about five miles east of the continental divide.

F. STEPHENS.

San Diego, Cal.

Correction of Errors in Identification.

I have been responsible for the following erroneous records:

(1) *Tringa bairdi* GRINNELL, Auk XV, April 1898, 126. The specimen referred to, taken at Sitka, later proved to be an immature spotted sandpiper (*Actitis macularia*)

(2) *Turdus aonalaschkae auduboni* GRINNELL, Bds. Pac. Slope Los Ang. Co., March 1898, 51. The specimen proves to be *Hylocichla a. aonalaschkae*, and not either *H. a. auduboni* or *H. a. sequoiensis*.

(3) *Otocoris alpestris leucolæma* BARLOW, Condor III, Nov. 1901, 167. I was to blame for this naming. The specimens were since compared by W. K. Fisher at Washington, and pronounced to be *Otocoris alpestris merrilli*.

These are all the mistakes in identification that I am so far aware of having made in any published writings. If others come to light, I propose to announce them at once, so as to avoid further danger of such erroneous records being quoted.

I would urge that other writers do the same. For mistakes are bound to be made at some time or another, and uncorrected errors of this kind have caused much trouble in the past. The sooner they are made right, the better. In the study of distribution and its modifying influences, a few mistaken records may cause confusion, and perhaps prevent correct deductions.

I do not include here changes in names, due to shifting nomenclature, or to separation of newly-recognized geographical forms. For the compiler will readily recognize the form meant usually by the locality. But out and out blunders like the above, where the spotted sandpiper was recorded as *bairdi*, could not be judged as such, unless admitted by the author. Such blunders we know to have been often made in breeding records; for instance, the "black swift" nesting at Seattle, and the "evening grosbeak" nesting in Yolo County.

It should be the duty of those who know of such errors to point them out as such, as soon as discovered.

JOSEPH GRINNELL.